

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office action mailed on 27 July 2005 (Paper No. 07242005).

Status of Claims

By this Amendment independent claims 4, 9, 14, 19, 21 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 23 and 24 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Thus, claims 4-10, 14-22 and 25-28 are pending in the application.

Claims 4, 9, 10, 14, 19, 20, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Yaegashi in view of Fujikawa and further in view of Arai for the reasons stated in section 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Furthermore, claims 5-8, 15-18, 21, 22, and 25 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Yaegashi in view of Fujikawa and in view of Arai and further in view of Miyazaki for the reasons stated in section 3 on page 3 of the Office Action. These rejections are traversed for the following reasons:

In the previous Office Action, various claims were rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Yaegashi in view of Fujikawa. The remaining claims were considered allowable if rewritten in independent form so as to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the previous Office Action, an Amendment was submitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office on May 10, 2005 to revise the claims to include the recited features of the claims previously considered to be allowable by the Examiner.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has cited Arai and Fujikawa as teaching the recited features of the claims previously considered to be allowable by the Examiner. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references supporting the proposed combinations.

That is, the Examiner states that it would be obvious to combine the references “in order to have a liquid crystal display device with increased performance.” Such a statement is not a reason for combining references but rather is a generalized conclusion applicable to any invention referring to a liquid crystal display device. It is always presumed that an invention has increased performance over the prior art.

Stated simply, the Examiner has used the teachings of the present application to combine features of several references in a nonobvious fashion to produce combinations which purportedly meet the recited limitations of the present claims.

Independent claims 4, 9, 14, 19, 21 and 26 have been amended to amend the passage “an aluminum-based metal layer, a titanium layer, and a diffusion prevention layer

interposed between the titanium and the aluminum-based layers” to read “an orderly stacked structure of a titanium layer, a diffusion prevention layer, an aluminum-based metal layer, a diffusion prevention layer, and a titanium layer”. It is submitted that Fujikawa reference cannot prevent reaction between the aluminum layer and the upper titanium layer.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the present claims are patentable over the prior art and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

An Information Disclosure Statement was submitted on 29 September 2005. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider this Information Disclosure Statement as well as considering the previously submitted July 12, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P57001
Date: 10/27/05
I.D.: REB/HMZ